1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
2	FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA					
3	EASTERN DIVISION					
4						
5	DAVID DAVIS,					
6	Plaintiff,					
7	vs. CASE NO. 3:06-CV-0054-VPM					
8	CITY OF PHENIX CITY, ALABAMA,					
9	et al.,					
10	Defendants.					
L1						
12						
L3	* * * * * * * * *					
L 4						
L5	DEPOSITION OF H.H. ROBERTS, taken pursuant to					
L6	stipulation and agreement before Shannon M.					
L 7	Williams, Certified Court Reporter and Commissioner					
L8	for the State of Alabama at Large, in the offices of					
9	City Hall, 601 12th Street, Phenix City, Alabama, on					
20	Tuesday, November 6, 2007, commencing at					
21	approximately 11:16 a.m. EST.					
22						
23	* * * * * * * * *					
24						
25						

1	APPEARANCES						
2	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:						
3	THOMAS A. WOODLEY						
	Woodley & McGillivary						
4	1125 15th Street N.W. Suite 400						
5	Washington, D.C. 20005						
6	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:						
7	JAMES P. GRAHAM, JR. 712 13th Street						
8	P.O. Box 3380 Phenix City, Alabama 36868-3380						
9	Filenia Cicy, maddina 30000 0000						
10	JAMES R. MCKOON, JR. McKoon & Associates						
11	925 Broad Street						
12	P.O. Box 3220 Phenix City, Alabama 36868-3220						
13							
14	ALSO PRESENT:						
15	Cole Dugan David Davis						
16	Wallace Hunter						
17	EXAMINATION INDEX						
18	BY MR. WOODLEY  BY MR. MCKOON  45						
19	DI MA. MCROON						
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

STIPULATIONS

It is hereby stipulated and agreed by and between counsel representing the parties that the deposition of H.H. ROBERTS is taken pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and that said deposition may be taken before Shannon M. Williams, Certified Court Reporter and Commissioner for the State of Alabama at Large, without the formality of a commission; that objections to questions other than objections as to the form of the questions need not be made at this time but may be reserved for a ruling at such time as the deposition may be offered in evidence or used for any other purpose as provided for by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

It is further stipulated and agreed by and between counsel representing the parties in this case that said deposition may be introduced at the trial of this case or used in any manner by either party hereto provided for by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

## H.H. ROBERTS

The witness, having first been duly sworn or affirmed to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. WOODLEY:

- Q. Mr. Roberts, I think you know by now, my name is Tom Woodley. I'm counsel for Mr. David Davis in this lawsuit against the city, Chief Hunter, and yourself. You're aware of that?
  - A. I'm aware of that.
- Q. And you had your deposition taken earlier in this case, correct?
  - A. I have.
- Q. Let me go through a couple of preliminaries just to make sure we're still on the same wavelength. You've now been placed under oath again so you're obligated to tell the complete and full truth. Do you understand that?
  - A. I understand.
- Q. If at any time you don't understand or hear one of my questions, please stop me immediately and I will be more than happy to rephrase or repeat that question to ensure that you do, in fact, understand my question. Do you understand that?

1 A. I understand.

- Q. You have to wait until I finish my question before you begin your answer so that this distinguished court reporter can take down all of the words that we say today. Do you understand that?
  - A. I understand.
- Q. Is there any reason today, medication or otherwise, that you might be in any way impaired in understanding my question and responding to my questions?
  - A. No.
- Q. Okay. Let me invite your attention to the binder of exhibits which you have in front of you. And Mr. McKoon has a full set of these exhibits as well. Exhibit Number 1 is the notice of depositions that we served concerning this round of depositions in the case. And you have been designated as the city's Rule 30(b)(6) witness to give knowledgeable and informed testimony in certain subject matter areas. Are you aware of that?
  - A. I'm aware of that.
- Q. Let me invite your attention to page 2 of the Notice of Deposition. Paragraph one is an area where you have been designated as a Rule 30(b)(6)

witness for the city, and that states as follows:

"All actions, agendas, minutes, notes, notices,
memoranda, summaries, correspondence, media reports,
e-mails, and other documents which relate in any way
to city employees that have addressed or spoken to
city council members in any public meetings or
conferences of the city council for the period
January 1, 2001 to the present."

See where it says that?

A. I do.

- Q. Are you prepared today to give testimony on that subject?
  - A. I am.
- Q. Paragraph two states as follows: "All actions, memoranda, correspondence, e-mails, notes, notices, media reports, and other documents which relate in any way to any communications in writing or verbal that any city employees have had with city council members outside of public meetings for the period January 1, 2001 to the present."

See where it says that?

- A. I do.
- Q. Are you prepared to give testimony on that subject as well?
  - A. I am.

Q. Going to paragraph four, it provides as					
follows: "All actions, memoranda, correspondence,					
e-mails, notes, notices, grievances, warnings,					
counseling forms, reprimands, disciplinary actions					
and other documents which relate in any way to the					
adoption, implementation, application and					
enforcement of Section 2.054 of the city's merit					
system rules and regulations."					

Do you see where it says that?

A. I do.

- Q. And are you also prepared to give testimony on that subject?
  - A. I am.
- Q. Paragraph seven: "All facts, memoranda, correspondence, e-mails, notes, notices, and other documents which relate in any way to information obtained by defendant H.H. Roberts that the plaintiff and other city employees have the constitutional First Amendment right of free expression."

Do you see where it says that?

- A. I do.
- Q. Are you prepared to give testimony on that subject as well?
  - A. I am.

1	Q. And lastly, paragraph eight: "All facts,						
2	memoranda, correspondence, e-mails, notes, notices,						
3	and other documents which relate in any way to						
4	information obtained by defendant H.H. Roberts that						
5	the plaintiff and other city employees have the						
6	constitutional First Amendment right of free						
7	association."						
8	See where it says that?						
9	A. I do.						
10	Q. Are you prepared to give knowledgeable and						
11	authoritative testimony						
12	A. I am.						
13	Q on behalf of the city on that subject as						
14	well?						
15	A. I am.						
16	Q. Chief Roberts, I'm kind of curious, do you						
17	use a computer?						
18	A. I do.						
19	Q. Do you use e-mails?						
20	A. I do.						
21	Q. Have you done that for years?						
22	A. Pretty good length of time.						
23	Q. Okay. And refresh my recollection. When						

were you appointed or selected as city manager for

the Phenix City jurisdiction?

24

3					
ž	75	5	53	-	
1	A. 2	1	[ ]	- 1	
- 3	to the the state of	~	V		

2.5

- Q. So you've been city manager for the last six-plus years?
  - A. Six years and one month.
- Q. And do you, on occasion, send and receive e-mails to other department heads concerning city business?
  - A. Occasionally.
- Q. Okay. Do you recall, in connection with the newspaper article that came out in September 2005, which is Exhibit 14 if you want to take a look at that. And again, just for the Record, this is that newspaper article in which Mr. Davis and a number of other firefighters were interviewed and quoted concerning issues affecting the city's fire department.

Do you recall, after you were aware of that newspaper article, that you sent any e-mails or memoranda to the chief of the fire department or anyone else in the city about this newspaper article?

- A. I don't recall right off the top of my head. I would be willing to look at any that you might have.
  - Q. So it's possible that e-mails could exist

on this subject?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Not to my knowledge. I do not remember sending one.
- Q. Have you been asked by anyone, including the city attorneys in this case, to look back through your e-mails to see whether or not there were any e-mail communications either sent by you or received by you concerning this newspaper article?
  - A. Only through the city attorneys.
  - Q. I don't understand your response.
- A. They are the only ones that asked me to review and get the criteria that y'all had requested.
- Q. Okay. But were you specifically asked to look at your e-mail?
- A. All e-mails, sir, is what I was asked to look at.
- Q. And no e-mails, as far as I know, have been produced in this case. So does that mean that there were no e-mails when you reviewed concerning the subject of this newspaper article?
  - A. I did not recover any.
  - Q. Did you, in fact, look?
  - A. The city clerk looked, sir.
  - Q. Okay. Same questions with regard to the

incident of the discharge of Mr. Davis which occurred in April of 2006. And I'm sure you'll remember that he apparently spoke to the mayor, Mayor Hardin; and as a result of that, at least in part, he was a few days later terminated. You're aware of that, right?

- A. I'm aware he was terminated.
- Q. Okay. Were there any e-mails that you sent or received from anyone concerning his communication with the mayor, the investigation of the situation, and his eventual discharge?
  - A. Not to my knowledge.

- Q. And have you looked to see if you had received or sent any e-mails on that subject?
- A. I have not received any. Neither have I sent any.
- Q. But have you looked to see if there were, in fact, any?
- A. As I stated earlier, the city clerk was requested to gather this information, and that's the point of contact that put the information together, sir.
  - Q. Who is city clerk?
  - A. Martha Harris.
  - Q. And how did she look whether or not there

were any e-mails on these subjects?

The

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Sir, that's a question that you would have to ask her.
  - O. You're not aware of how she did it?
  - A. No, sir, I am not.
- Q. Did she go into your computer or hard drive or did somebody else do that?
- A. It's possible she could have had the IT director to do that, sir.
- Q. But are you specifically knowledgeable and aware that she made a good faith effort to see if there were any e-mails and came up with zero?
  - A. I'm confident Ms. Harris did her job.
- Q. Do you know whether or not you had any interoffice memoranda or any written papers going to Chief Hunter or the HR director, Mrs. Goodwin, concerning the newspaper article in September 2005 and the discharge of Mr. Davis in April 2006?
  - A. Not that I know of.
- Q. So as far as you know, all of the documents that are relevant to these issues in this lawsuit have been produced?
- A. All of the documents that I know of have been produced to you.
  - Q. Let me invite your attention, Mr. Roberts,

to Exhibit 35. This is a memo from Assistant Chief Hanson to Chief Hunter dated September 21, 2005, and it's regarding the verbal counseling with D.E. Karl — with a K — Taylorson. And this concerns that newspaper article in September 2005 which you just looked at. Have you seen this document, this memo, before today?

- A. I read this memo, yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Concerning the substance of this memo, do you agree with the substance, or is there anything in here which you would disagree with or take exception to? And as I said with Chief Hunter, when I ask you to look at a document, take all the time you need, Mr. Roberts, before you respond to my questions.
  - A. Now restate your question.
- Q. Now that you have had a chance to read through and review this memorandum, Exhibit 35, is there anything contained in here that you disagree with or take exception to?
  - A. No, sir.

2.2

Q. Okay. You'll see in the second sentence of this memo it says as follows: "The statements issued during this interview by personnel to the news reporter were done in complete conflict of the

Phenix City employees merit system (Section 2.054 - free speech)."

Do you see where it says that?

A. I do.

- Q. And do you agree with that? In other words, that the comments made by Mr. Davis and the firefighters in that newspaper article on September 2005 were in complete conflict with that section of the merit system rules and regulations?
  - A. I would have to agree with that.
- Q. Do you recall if any comments or quotes they made in that newspaper article were not in conflict with the merit system rules and regulations, Section 2.054?
- A. I would have to reread it. I do not know that answer.
- Q. Okay. Again, it's Exhibit 14 if you want to reference it, Mr. Roberts, but maybe to shorten up the questioning and answering, Mr. Davis and the other firefighters talked about staffing concerns in the fire department, so their discussion and quotations, particularly of Mr. Davis on staffing, would that have been in conflict with Section 2.054 of the merit system rules and regulations?
  - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. And there was also a comment by Mr. Davis, and I believe other firefighters, in that newspaper article about poor employee morale in the fire department. Would that subject also be in conflict with the merit system rules and regulations?
  - A. I feel it would.
- Q. Now, is it your position that before a firefighter can speak with the media about issues any issues affecting the fire department, that the firefighter has to pursue the chain of command and get prior permission before talking to the media?
  - A. Yes.

Î

- Q. And is that true with regard to issues of staffing in the fire department, recruitment in the fire department, training in the fire department, adequate protective gear and apparatus in the fire department, dispatching procedures, response times in the fire department? Are all of those subjects that the firefighter would have to get prior clearance through the chain of command in the city before he or she could speak on those issues to a media representative?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Other than Mr. Davis, has anyone in the fire department, to your knowledge, been disciplined

1	for speaking to the media about fire department						
2	issues?						
3	A. I don't I do not know the answer.						
4	MR. MCKOON: Wait a minute. I'm going to						
5	object because I'm not sure he was, but just						
6	for the Record.						
7	Q. Let me broaden the question. Do you know						
8	of any firefighters who have been disciplined for						
9	speaking to the media?						
10	A. Not to my knowledge, I do not.						
11	Q. Later on in this Exhibit 35, the memo again						
12	from Assistant Chief Hanson to Chief Hunter which						
13	you have in front of you, it says in the second						
14	paragraph, second sentence: "These guidelines are						
15	to be followed by everyone employed by the City of						
16	Phenix City."						
17	Is that an accurate statement?						
18	A. That is accurate.						
19	Q. And then the next sentence says "he",						
20	referring to Mr. Taylorson, had and, again, the						
21	word not has been inadvertently dropped. I think we						
22	had an understanding with Mr. McKoon						
23	MR. MCKOON: That is correct.						

there so it would say properly as follows: "He had

Q. -- that the word "not" should be inserted

24

not received nor requested permission from any fire department supervisors to speak with a member of the news media concerning issues within the fire department." Is that an accurate statement, Mr. Roberts? To the best of my knowledge, it is accurate. Now, as the city manager, these are called counseling forms. Do you consider this to be at least a mild form of a reprimand or discipline? Α. It's a form that the merit system allows to be put under, I believe it's a Class I, where you have a counseling form and it goes into the personnel folder. My question really is, is this sort of the 0. first stage or mild form of discipline or reprimand? It's a very mild form. Α. 0. Would you consider it a reprimand? I would consider it a counseling statement. Α.

- Q. But apparently they are inserted, as Mr. Taylorson's was, in their personnel file,
- 22 | correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- A. That is -- yes, sir.
- Q. And what is the purpose of putting it in the personnel file?

Α.	That's	by	merit	system	rules	and
regulati	ons.					

- Q. Is it then to be used possibly for future reference in the event that the same individual might have some future discipline?
  - A. It could be used.

- Q. And have these counseling forms been used for further discipline down the road for the individual?
  - A. I'm sure they have.
- Q. In the last sentence here, Assistant Chief Hanson is telling Chief Hunter that "I advised him" again referring to Mr. Taylorson "I advised him that the city would not put up with another episode of speaking to the media without prior approval."

As far as you know, is that a correct statement?

- A. From reading it, I would say it's a correct statement, but I do not know the intent of Assistant Chief Hanson.
- Q. With regard to that newspaper article, again in September of 2005, let me ask you this question: If Mr. Davis or the other eight or nine firefighters who were interviewed by the newspaper

reporter in that article had, in fact, requested prior permission through the chain of command up to your level as the city manager, would you have given your okay?

- A. I would feel and this is going to be an explanation first, I would have to look at the substance and if I felt like it was of concern and of good intent, then I would forward it to the city council.
  - O. You would what?

- A. Forward it to the city council. And at that time, they would have the opportunity to voice their concern to the city council. And then probably from there, the city council would give the okay or could give the okay.
- Q. To the firefighter as to whether he could speak to the media?
  - A. That is correct.
  - Q. Has that procedure ever been followed?
  - A. Not to my knowledge.
- Q. Well, going back to this newspaper article, Exhibit 14, reading through the subjects that were addressed by Mr. Davis and other firefighters, they covered their concerns about what they felt was understaffing in the fire department and low

employee morale in the fire department, among other issues.

Would those have been subjects that you would have felt it was okay for them to speak to the media about?

- A. They would have been subjects that I would have been happy to discuss with them and carry to the council if they felt the need to go there first.
- Q. And then I take it you would let the council make that decision whether or not they would be permitted to talk to the media about those issues?
  - A. That is correct, yes, sir.
- Q. Now, some of these firefighters mentioned in this newspaper article that they were fearful of retaliation for speaking to the media about these issues. Are you aware of that?
  - A. No, sir, I'm not.
- Q. You don't have any reason to know why someone might have been fearful of retaliation?
  - A. I do not.

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q. In this article, Council Member Ray Bush indicates that he apparently, in the past, attempted to be a mediator with many of the firefighters in the city about these issues of concern. Are you

aware of that?

- A. I read that in the article, sir.
- Q. Did you participate in discussions with Council Member Bush about that subject?
  - A. Not to my knowledge, no, sir.
- Q. Now, let me invite your attention to Exhibit 3, which is the city grievance procedure. And I know from your earlier deposition testimony that you are very familiar with this section of the merit system rules and regulations, which is Section 15.02 concerning the subject of employee complaints and grievances. Is it your position that before Mr. Davis and other firefighters spoke to the newspaper reporter with the resulting article in September 2005, that they should have first pursued this grievance procedure concerning the issues that they addressed?
  - A. I do.
    - Q. Did you want to add to that?
- A. There's two forms two roadways that they can travel.
  - Q. What are they?
- A. One is the grievance procedure. And then, of course, they have their own SOPs that they can follow.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0. That would be before they address the media on issues. Is that what you mean? The media or council, yes, sir. A. 0. Or city council? A. Yes, sir. But as I read the language in Section 15.023 of the merit system rules and regulations, it says -- you may want to look at this subparagraph D -- at the end of the grievance procedure, it says "the decision of city manager shall be final and the employee shall have no further rights of administrative appeal." Do you see where it says that? I do. Α. 0. And is that an accurate statement that you're the end of the road in terms of the grievance procedure? It is as far as the grievance procedure with the fire department and police department or

Q. Now, I'm trying to understand the scope, either broad or narrow, of the grievance process.

through SOPs, which will give them another route,

the code enforcement officers. However, the SOPs --

they have the ultimate ability to get to the council